cs70, fall 2001 midterm 2 solutions professor wagner

Problem #1 (18 pts.) Short-answer questions

(a) C(n,i)/2^n

(b) 0.3 <= Pr[E union F] <= 0.5. 0.3 occurs if E is a subset of F, and 0.5 occurs if E and F are disjoint.

(c) 2002, since each such string is of the form [k]1[2000-k]0 (where the quantity in brackets indicates the number of times to repeat) for some k in $\{0, 1, ..., 2001\}$, and there are 2002 such k.

(d) All of them, since $2z = n+1 = 1 \pmod{n}$, so z-inverse = 2 (mod n). (Alternate explanation: gcd((n+1)/2,n) = gcd((n+1)/2,(n-1)/2) = gcd(1,(n-1)/2)=1 by Euclidean algorithm, so gcd(z,n) = 1, so z has an inverse mod n.)

Problem #2 (12 pts.) Digit sums

Consider an arbitrary natural number n.

Write n in decimal: $n = Ak*10^{k} + ... + A1*10 + A0$

Then

 $\begin{array}{l} f(n) &= Ak^3 + \ldots + A1^3 + A0^3 \\ &= Ak + \ldots + A1 + A0 \\ &= Ak^*10^k + \ldots + A1+10 + A0 \\ &= n \pmod{3} \end{array} \\ \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{by defn of f} \\ \text{since 10^j = 1 (mod 3) for all j} \\ \end{array} \right]$

n was arbitrary, so this must hold for all natural numbers.

Problem #3 (12 pts.) Computing with polynomials

(a) $O(d^2(\lg p)^2)$ There are $O(d^2)$ cross-terms, and each requires $O((\lg p)^2)$ work to do a modular multiplication and addition.

(b) $O(d(\lg p)^2)$ Computing the sequence 1, u, u², ..., u^d mod p takes d multiplications, then multiplying by Ai mod p takes d+1 multiplications, plus d more additions.

(c) 1. Let $v = f(u) \mod p$ using part (b). 2. Return $v^2 \mod p$ Takes $O(d(\lg p)^2 + (\lg p)^2) = O(d(\lg p)^2)$ time. Note that computing $f(x)^2$ first (using part (c)) then evaluating at u gives a slower algorithm.

Problem #4 (8 pts.) Mystical polynomials

(a) No. f(6) = 57, which is divisible by 3 and hence not prime. (But note that f(3) = 3, which is prime, so f(3) is not a counterexample to f being mystical.)

(b)

which means that 3 is a divisor of f(3). Consequently, f(3) cannot be prime, which implies that f is not mystical.

The bold statement is wrong. The case f(3) = 3 is compatible with 3 dividing f(3), and yet 3 is prime. Hence the underlined statement does not follow, and in fact the polynomial in part (a) gives an example where the reasoning breaks down. Worse still, the "theorem" is wrong: f(x) = 3 is a counterexample (it is mystical).

Posted by HKN (Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Honor Society) University of California at Berkeley If you have any questions about these online exams please contact <u>examfile@hkn.eecs.berkeley.edu.</u>